

REMARKS

This is responsive to the Office Action dated June 6, 2006. Claims 14 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,980,583 issued to Staub et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,985,385 issued to Gottfried for the reasons of record stated on pages 2 and 3 of the Office Action.

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection in view of the remarks contained herein. In order to establish a prima facie case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met: 1) there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings; 2) there must be a reasonable expectation of success; and 3) the prior art references must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. Staub et al. purports to relate to a method of manufacturing durable press garments by inserting garments into an apparatus capable of tumbling the garments. The garments may be impregnated with a durable press resin. Gottfried purportedly relates to a fire and heat protection wrapping system for wrapping conduits, cable trays, transmission lines, cables, and other electrical transmission devices associated with the transmission of electricity and electrical signals, and gas and oil pipelines where there is severe exposure to high temperatures in excess of three (3) hours in duration. [See Gottfried column 1, lines 6 – 18].

Applicants respectfully submit that a prima facie case of obviousness has not been established. Column 7, lines 25 – 30 of Staub et al. teach that the durable press resin may be heated to about 130°F prior to injection into the drum. Staub et al. also teaches that in order to maintain the 130°F temperature of the durable press resin, the main chemical storage tank can be insulated. [See Staub et al. column 7, lines 25 – 29]. Gottfried teaches a fire and thermal protection wrapping system to protect from fire and to reduce the transmission of heat. [See Gottfried Abstract]. Gottfried teaches that it is desirable to have low heat transmission to an electrical transmission device and that it is desirable to absorb excess heat generated from the electrical transmission device. [See Gottfried, column 1, lines 63 – 67]. This is just the opposite of the result that Staub et al. is attempting to accomplish by insulating the chemical storage tank (i.e.; Staub et al. teaches the desirability of maintaining, retaining, and transmitting heat so that the durable press resin which is heated in the storage tank will not lose heat as it is transferred from the storage tank in a heated state and subsequently injected into the drum in a heated state). Gottfried on the other hand teaches the desirability of absorbing and reducing the transmission of heat. Hence, one would expect that by insulating the chemical storage tank of Staub et al. in accordance with the teachings of Gottfried, the chemical storage tank of Staub et al. would remove and absorb the heat from the heated durable press resin. This is just the opposite result of what Staub et al. is trying to accomplish. Hence, not only is there no motivation to combine the teachings of Gottfried with Staub et al., there would also be no reasonable expectation of success. Thus, as the basic requirements of a prima facie case of obviousness as required by MPEP §2143 have not been established, Applicants respectfully submit that the obviousness rejection over Staub et al. in view of Gottfried is improper and should be withdrawn.

SUMMARY

Applicants respectfully request that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be reconsidered and withdrawn and that Claims 14 and 15 be allowed.

Respectfully submitted,
FOR: PANCHERI ET AL.;

BY: 

Julia A. Glazer
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 41,783
(513) 627-4132

October 5, 2006
Cincinnati, Ohio